REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 remain in the application and stand finally rejected. Reconsideration of the final rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following reasons.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because, according to the last office action, the preamble describes a method of providing product information whereas the body of the claim describes the process of offering a computer program. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

There is no inconsistency between the preamble and body of claim 1. The preamble of claim 1 recites a method of providing product information, while the body of claim 1 recites providing third party information about a computer program. As is well known, a computer program may be a product depending on whether it is being produced for commercial sale. In fact, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002538 by Ling ("Ling"), cited in the last office action, discusses **software products** for sale or rental (Ling Abstract). It is respectfully submitted that the proposition that a "computer program is not considered a product unless it is tangibly embodied" has no support in either law or common practice.

Therefore withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection -- 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Ling and Shiratori)

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ling in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,111 to Shiratori et al. ("Shiratori"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted in the last office action, Ling does not disclose the process of detecting an occurrence of a first window in the computer. This is not surprising considering that Ling merely pertains to the use of tokens in electronic commerce (Ling, Abstract).

The last office action suggests that it would have been obvious to modify Ling to